

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search and consideration of the arguments.

No claims have been added, cancelled, or amended. Hence, Claims 1-26 are pending in the application.

SUMMARY OF THE REJECTIONS/OBJECTIONS

Claims 1-2, 7-9, 14-15, and 19-21 were rejected under U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2004/0254948 to Yao (hereinafter “Yao”).

Claims 3, 4, 6, 10-12, 16, 18, 22-24 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yao in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2001/0021929.

THE REJECTIONS BASED ON THE PRIOR ART

Claims 1-2, 7-9, 14-15, and 19-21 were rejected under U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2004/0254948 to Yao (hereinafter “Yao”).

To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim. MPEP 2131 “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” Id., Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053

Claims 1 and 14 contain a number of features not inherently or expressly described in the prior art reference by Yao and therefore render the claims allowable.

Claims 1 and 14 recite:

a database server receiving a request to execute a database statement, wherein the request specifies the database statement and a tag that does not conform to a database language;

wherein said tag specifies at least one parameter field and at least one parameter value;

in response to receiving the request, said database server storing the tag;
said database server executing said database statement, wherein during execution of said database statement said database server provides access to one or more of the at least one parameter values through a tag access mechanism provided by said database server.

One feature not taught or suggested by Yao is “a database server receiving a request to execute a database statement, wherein the request specifies the database statement and a tag that does not conform to a database language.” In a system described by Yao, the database server **does not** receive a request specifying a database statement and tags that do not conform to a database language. Furthermore the “tags” as described by Yao **do** conform to a database language.

Yao describes a system for efficiently performing extraction, transformation and loading (ETL) of data between an operational system and a data warehouse. The ETL system contains an ETL Driver Module, SQL Decomposition Database, and an Enterprise System Interface, FIG 4. Yao. The ETL system takes as an input an ETL SQL file which contains SQL statements and tags, and transforms the SQL statements to a new set of SQL statements.

Neither the SQL Decomposition Database nor the Enterprise System Interface receives a request specifying a database statement and a tag that does not conform to a database language because the tags are consumed by the ETL driver. Specifically, with respect to the SQL Decomposition Database the ETL driver module uses the interpreted tags as keys to look up command instructions. “The SQL decomposition database 465 stores command instructions in association with recognized command tags. By matching the command tags identified in a SQL

file 440 to command tags identified in the SQL definition database 465, associated command instructions may be identified.” In order to perform a database match or lookup, the tag must be used as a key and therefore the tag is a part of the database statement conforming to the database language.

The tags are not passed to the Enterprise System Interface either. The ETL driver module uses the tags along with command instructions to transform the SQL statements contained in the ETL SQL file to a plurality of SQL statements which can be more efficiently executed. It is the plurality of SQL statements, sans tags that are passed to the enterprise system interface. “Based on the command instruction tags and tag parameters, the ETL driver module 460 decomposes the SQL instructions into modified SQL instructions that may be performed in a more efficient manner. The modified SQL instructions are executed on the operational data of the enterprise transient system 410 via the enterprise system interface 470.”

Furthermore tags contained in ETL SQL file as taught by Yao **do** conform to a database language. The tags take the form of SQL comments. “The tags, in a preferred embodiment, are made part of comments in the ETL SQL file 440. Since they are in comments, known mechanisms will ignore the tags present in comments such that the known mechanisms may execute and test the ETL SQL file 440 under a command line environment.” [0046].

Another feature not taught or suggested by Yao is “said database server executing said database statement, wherein during execution of said database statement said database server provides access to one or more of the at least one parameter values through a tag access mechanism provided by said database server.” As described earlier, Yao does not suggest or teach that any of the databases in the ETL system receive requests specifying a database statement and a tag that does not conform to a database language. Because neither database receives requests and tags, neither database could possibly reference the tags. And even if the

database server were to receive tags as specified by Yao, the tags will be treated as comments by the database server and discarded by the database server.

The pending claims not discussed so far are dependant claims that depend on an independent claim that is discussed above. Because each of the dependant claims include the limitations of claims upon which they depend, the dependant claims are patentable for at least those reasons the claims upon which the dependant claims depend are patentable. Removal of the rejections with respect to the dependant claims and allowance of the dependant claims is respectfully requested. In addition, the dependent claims introduce additional limitations that independently render them patentable. Due to the fundamental difference already identified, a separate discussion of those limitations is not included at this time.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are patentable over the art of record, including the art cited but not applied. Accordingly, allowance of all claims is hereby respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages or credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,
HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Yury A. Perzov
Yury A. Perzov
Reg. No. 58,547

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, CA 95110
(408) 414-1080
Date: April 24, 2007
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on Apr. 24, 2007

by

Martina Placid
Martina Placid